DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 193 SP 026 736

AUTHOR Saunders, Robert L.
TITLE The Preservice Education of Teachers
PUB DATE 13 Jun 85
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented to the Forum on Teacher Education, Appalachia Educational Laboratory (Virginia Beach, VA, June 13, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Teachers; Higher Education; Internship Programs; *Preservice Teacher Education; Program Effectiveness; *Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

Three fundamental questions regarding preservice teacher education are examined in this paper: (1) what preservice teacher education should do and what it should not be expected to do; (2) the important characteristics of programs needed to prepare teachers for effective teaching in the future; and (3) the basic ingredients in effective preservice programs. In discussing the role and function of preservice teacher education, it is pointed out that the goal of such education should be to prepare entry-level teachers who are well educated in a general sense, in possession of a strong in-depth grounding in a teaching field, and who have a good pedagogical grounding. An analysis is presented of the nature and composition of effective preservice preparation programs. The discussion of this topic focuses upon four major components of a sound preservice program: (1) general education/liberal studies; (2) undergirding disciplines/pre-professional studies; (3) academic specializations; and (4) professional (pedagogic) studies. Concluding remarks include a recommendation for extension of preservice education with a year of internship. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Saunders

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED264193

The Preservice Education of Teachers*

Robert L. Saunders, Dean
College of Education
Memphis State University
and
President, American Association
of
Colleges for Teacher Education

Introduction

It's nice to be with you today and to be a part of this conference.

What a timely and important topic you selected for me to address. I gladly accepted the invitation, both because I have wanted to contribute as much as I could to AEL and because I wanted to do an update on the research and authoritative opinion on this topic and to put my own views in writing. Parenthetically, my own views have changed a good bit in the last five years and I speak them with a good bit more confidence that I would have just a year or so ago. Fortunately, those of us charged with the awesome task of leading, administering, and orchestrating the education of teachers and those of you charged with the employment, supervision and education of them, have a much better knowledge base to work with than just a few years ago.

I will use only a portion of that knowledge base today - obviously that portion I believe to be most germane to the topic.

---

* Prepared for and presented to the Forum on Teacher Education, Appalachia Educational Laboratory, June 13, 1985, Virginia Beach, VA.

SP026736

Naturally, it will be filtered through my biases and philosophical moorings. My comments will be colored further by my experiences in the AACTE Task Force on Extended Programs (1984) and the work we have done at Memphis State in making two major changes in our program during the past four years. We made a major change in our 4-year program and then decided that it was insufficient so we plunged headlong into a five-year configuration. I can even show you some bruises and scars, if you would like, from those activities.

My comments are in three categories: (1) what pre-service teacher education should do and what it should not be expected to do, (2) the basic ingredients in effective pre-service programs, those that will serve education best in the foreseeable future, and (3) some important characteristics of programs which I believe are the kinds needed to prepare teachers for effective teaching in the schools of tomorrow (remembering that teachers entering the classroom now and for the past few years will, if they become a career teacher, spend more than half their career teaching in the 21st century).

One qualification: Mindful that the theme of this conference includes reference to issues in teacher education, I must confess that I have not organized my remarks directly on that basis. I have not identified particular issues per se and commented on them directly. Rather, I have woven them in, mentioned them in context, and offered some discussion. Dean Corrigan will probably share with you tomorrow his "Baker's Dozen" issues which he feels now pervade the field of teacher education. Several of the issues I deal with in this paper are on Dean's list of 13.

The Role and Function of
Pre-service Teacher Education

There is widespread but not unanimous believe belief that teachers need to be professionally trained. Some of our harshest critics contend that only a good grounding in liberal arts in the teaching field is necessary. But many others (including, still, most state boards of education and most legislatures) see the need for the professional component. Many of them believe, however, that the professional component is not taught as well as it should be, that it is too large, and that it contains too much "fluff". But, very importantly, most decision-makers and most policy makers are unwilling to give it up. The reason is, I think, that they are fundamentally afraid to put untrained, uncertified teachers in front of boys and girls. They want a "security check", a reasonable assurance that the teacher novice is not a great risk, an unknown. quantity. And herein is one of the most important purposes of pre-service teacher education, namely, to enable new teachers to enter the work place with sufficient entry-level skills to permit their entry to be low risk.

And entry-level teachers should not be expected to be much more than that. We have been relatively silent as school boards, employers, and the general public view the beginning teacher as if he/she were a proven, experienced veteran.

I illustrate this point with a true story. On the stage one Saturday morning a few years ago at commencement exercises the dean of engineering sitting next to me was grousing about the law school graduates being "hooded", what a "mottly-looking" group

they were (with their stacked heels, long hair, etc.). He mumbled to me, "Bob, if you were in serious legal difficulty would you hire one of these birds to handle your case?" I thought a few minutes and said, "no", rather emphatically. Several thoughts went through my mind. Most of these "birds" won't try a case for several years, some of them never. Certainly none of them would be in court on Monday. But most of our teacher education graduates would be teaching kids their first day on the job - more often than not in the most difficult, least desirable schools and with the heaviest loads. Bordering on criminal treatment, these cases are often the ones critics have in mind when they charge that "teachers can't teach". Even novice doctors have a supervised two-year internship - and that is after seven years of in-class preparation.

My point is two fold: (1) entry level teachers should not be expected to function as experienced professionals, and their early assignments should reflect this contention, and (2) ways must be found to help beginning teachers go through an organized induction program. On this latter point, several of reform reports recommend the need for better programs of induction. The one Phil Schelacty is putting in place in Louisville, KY is exciting, I think.

What I have said on this point has strong implications, also, for in-service education programs. We need to do much more in this arena, but that's not my assignment here.

To summarize this section, the goal of pre-service teacher education should be to prepare entry-level teachers who are well educated in a general sense, in possession of a strong, in-depth

grounding in a teaching field (or fields) and who have a good pedagogical grounding. Additionally, entry-level teachers need to have both the ability and the desire to develop professionally through the years, to learn on the job, and to increase their knowledge base (in all three component areas) by reflective experience and by further study, both formal and informal.

What kind of a preparation program is needed to do this. That is my next category of comments.

The Nature and Composition of Effective Preservice Preparation Programs

There is no single model that all of us will buy into. Nor should we, given that no single model has emerged from research, from authoritative opinion, or from best practice. But there is general agreement around on the few (three to six) basic components of a solid teacher education program and there is growing agreement about what should be in each component.

Perhaps the nearest thing teacher education has to the famous Flexner Report on medical education is the AACTE Bicentennial Commission Report on Educating a Profession (1976). That report identified four major components of the preservice program: General or Liberal Studies, Academic Specialization(s), The Foundations of Education, and the Professional Knowledge Base. In 1980 this work was expanded in an important document entitled "A Common Body of Practice for Teachers: The Challenge of PL94-142 to Teacher Education (1980). The report lists the following five components:

General/Liberal Studies

Subject Speciality(ies)

Undergirding Disciplines (Pre-Ed) (Psychology, Anthropology, Sociology, etc.)

Educational Foundations

Professional Studies,- knowledge - strategies - models - attitudes/values

Note that clinical, internship, laboratory and field studies are properly shown in this report as instructional modes, not as components.

Your own Bill Monahan has reported that it is well established that professional teacher education programs have four basic components of academic pursuit, namely: (1) general education, (2) teaching field(s) content, (3) professional studies, and (4) clinical internships (1984). Sorry, Bill, but clinical experiences are an instructional mode.

In 1982 an AACTE Task Force produced a fine report on the profile of the beginning teacher (1982). The report identified four major components of teacher preparation, as follows:

A. General Education

B. Disciplines Undergirding Education (Pre-professional)

C. Academic Specialization(s)

D. Professional Studies

This report went on to "profile" the nature and type of studies subsumed under each of these headings. It is a fine report and I recommend it to you.

There is no need to dwell further on taxonomy. What I want to do next is to talk about what should go into these major

components, in other words, to be more specific about the subject matter of preservice teacher education. Later I will address the competencies which beginning teachers should possess as a consequence of these studies. I'll use the taxonomy offered by the AACTE Task Force on the profile of the beginning teacher to deal with both the subject matter and the competencies.

General Education/Liberal Studies

This is a very important area, one that hour-wise has been treated rather satisfactorily in teacher education but in recent years has deteriorated in terms of course nature and purpose. It has been victimized to some extent by turf fights, by the increasing trend in arts and science colleges for their majors to be more career oriented, and by the use of courses as prerequisites for specialized study rather than for general, liberating purposes.

Most of us would agree with Boyer's (1981) statements about what general education should provide, namely, knowledge that enables students to understand themselves, their society, and the world they live in. Such studies, Boyer contends, should serve as a tool throughout life to solve problems, to think critically, and to comprehend past, present, and future events. He identifies six fundamental, interrelated areas necessary to do this for students. These areas are: (1) Communication, (2) understanding the importance of groups and institutions, (3) understanding the relationship of society and work, (4) understanding the relationship of nature and universe, (5) understanding the relationship of time and civilization, and (6) understanding

shared values and beliefs. I subscribe to Boyer's statement; it sets forth a kind of general education program that, if taught properly, would do wonders for teachers - and others.

There is, unfortunately, a great difference in what we see posing as general education/liberal studies and the kind of curriculum Boyer proposes. Typically, this component consists of 45-60 semester hours of fragmented, largely unrelated, courses which add up to whatever the student is able to make them do. Not only are our present courses disjointed and fragmented, too often they are confined to lower division, survey-type courses. As noted above, more often than not their real purpose is one of prerequisite, leading to another course on a linier scale and on to a graduate major, which in turn leads to an advanced graduate major.

We in teacher education compound the problem by permitting sizable chunks of general education to be used as part of the teaching field(s) content - add a few more courses in social studies to the general education requirement and you have a teaching endorsement. This practice is abominable - on two counts - but it goes on in most states even today.

We need very badly to improve our programs in general education. It's one of the messages - perhaps the major one - being given us by state boards of education and legislatures in their mandating standardized tests for both the admission into and graduation from teacher education programs.

To summarize this section, I use a phrase from the very recent report by the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education (1985). Entitled "A Call for Change in Teacher

Education, the report in adressing the matter of general education, stresses the importance of a "cohesive, planned program - not merely an accumulation of courses scattered across a large number of departments." More from this report later.

Undergirding Disciplines/Pre-professional Studies

This component has just recently surfaced as a visible component of teacher education. Formerly it was subsumed under general education in some institutions and in others treated as professional studies (Foundations professors like to say that they must spend half of their time teaching students the undergirding disciplines before they can teach pedagogical applications and implications.)

In any event, too little has been done with this component. Not unlike medical practice, pedagogy is largely an applied science - and art. It has predicates, underpinnings upon which its theories and formulations are based. It is not good enough to place this subject matter in the hands of general education professors. Neither is there enough time and space to attend to them within the professional studies component.

Again I use the Profile of the Beginning Teacher to specify further the nature and purpose of the undergirding disciplines. The Profile recommends studies in the anthropology, philosophy, psychology, and sociology, among others, because they offer contextual knowledge that undergirds professional practice in teaching as well as in other social professions. As a result of these studies, the report contends, teacher candidates should:

1. understand the principles and modes of inquiry

that illuminate human behavior, cultural influences, social institutions, and significant political, economic, and philosophical systems;

2. understand the major human and technological factors that foster and inhibit effective communication among individuals and social groups;

3. gain a sense of the disciplinary roots of professional practice shared by teachers and other human service professionals.

In other words, just as engineering depends upon preprofessional studies in physics, chemistry and mathematics; and medicine upon chemistry, biology, and physiology, so are studies in pedagogy dependent upon the social and behavorial sciences, particularily the disciplines of psychology, sociology, anthropology, political science and economics. Without these studies, the professional component of the teacher's preparation is built upon a weak foundation.

Academic Specializations(s)

Absolutely essential in the preparation of both elementary and secondary school teaching is the in-depth study of academic disciplines designed to contribute to those portions of the school curriculum for which a teacher has instructional responsibility. An either-or view of content and method in the preparation of teachers is both false and dangerous! Effective teachers possess knowledge of the subject matter as well as pedagogical knowledge and skills.

Teachers also need knowledge about the knowledge of their

teaching field subject matter--the elements of subject matter, its logical structure, uses, modes of inquiry, and ways in which information is manipulated and dependability determined. Denemark and Nutter, (1980), made this important point several years ago..

Although academic majors are most often recommended for secondary teacher preparation, such in-depth study could be of great value to elementary teachers--if it is not gained at the expense of a broader-ranging exposure to other subject fields included in the teacher's assignment, and if the staffing pattern of employing school systems takes into account the need for balance among the specialty areas of the teachers recruited. In fact, the report, "A Call for Change in Teacher Education," referred to earlier,advocates an academic major even for elementary school teachers.

The specialization is the subject of much criticism currently - and one in which teacher educators often feel that they are in a "Catch 22" situation. Many of us would gladly restrict students to a single teaching field in order for them to obtain an in-depth academic major equal to or even greater than the parallel major in arts and sciences. This makes good sense. But it is extremely difficult to do this in the face of demands from employing school boards and administrators who often prefer versatile teachers, persons who can teach in two fields, even a third, and occasionally a fourth field. There is simply no way to do this within a four-year curriculum, or even in a five-year curriculum if we want real depth in a teaching field. It should come as no surprise that virtually every state certification

program permits subject certification with rather low requirements - often little more than the courses taken to meet degree requirements in general education. Our critics should keep this in mind when they assert that teachers don't know their subject matter. Indeed, some do not - for reasons just mentioned.

Professional Studies

This component is also that one our critics have a field day with, asserting that it is too large, too "fluffy", little more than conventional wisdom, and an area of study which, if eliminated, would literally entice hordes of highly qualified arts and science majors into teaching. For a variety of reasons, this matter has been the battleground for continuous warfare between arts and science professors and educationists (as they often like to call us).

I will resist the tempatation to use this occasion to fire salvos at our critics. Instead, I will suggest what this component should do for students, identify some of our vulnerabilities and shortcomings, and suggest a few urgently needed corrections - reforms if you please.

First, a brief historical perspective, taken largely from the 1982 AACTE Task Force Report on extended programs. Teacher education has evolved more slowly than most other professions, however, at several points preparation programs were significantly strengthened and extended. Although a few normal schools were in existence by the mid 1880s, and a university chair of pedagogy was established as early as 1879 (at the University of Michigan), teacher training attained postsecondary status in a universal

sense only about the turn of this century when two-year post-secondary normal schools became commonplace. The normal schools had replaced "teacher institutes," an earlier model which ranged in duration across the country from several days to several months. About a fourth of the curricula of the normal schools was devoted to pedagogy.

By the mid 1920s normal schools had been extended into teachers colleges, with four-year curricula. Although the proportion of the curriculum devoted to pedagogy remained about the same, a doubling effect actually occurred due to the change from a two-year to a four-year curriculum. This significant extension of programs took about two decades to occur. It is important to remember that during this period teachers certificated through the normal schools worked side-by-side with those certificated through the four-year teachers colleges, in the same way that graduates of teacher institutes remained in the profession long after the entry of normal-school graduates. Departments of education in colleges and universities experienced similar beginnings and were transformed into schools and colleges of education in a manner similar to the changes just described.

This historical perspective helps make the point that during its relatively short existence teacher preparation has experienced two major extensions. Both extensions occurred within periods of societal concern about education. Are societal concerns presently being expressed telling us to make another giant step? I think so.

There is a knowledge base for professional studies, a rather substantial one, in fact, as B. O. Smith points out in his very

helpful book, a Design for a School of Pedagogy (1980):

> If the history of medical education has any lesson for us, it is that the problem with pedagogical education is not the lack of knowledge so much as the lack of will to institutionalize what we know into an effective program of pedagogical education.

In an article written a few years ago by Bill Monahan, entitled "Straight Talk about Teacher Education," he said that "it is not that we don't know how to prepare teachers, but rather that we don't do what we know how to do." How true. There are several reasons why we don't, some our fault and others beyond our control. Bill was talking about the obsolescence of four-year programs, which is a major obstacle and one about which I will comment later.

I want now to talk about what should the professional studies component consist of, what it should do for students seeking to become teachers, and what sorts of enabling changes must be made if sound, effective, and credible programs are to become commonplace. I could cite a dozen or two formats and designs, but time and energy permit only two or three.

First, I will use NCATE's definition of professional studies. I use this source because it is new (adopted by the Council just five days ago in St. Louis) and because it is the product of years of intensive study by dozens of our most learned colleagues in teacher education, colleagues in the various specialty groups, and in the K-12 sector.

The NCATE Redesign (1985) defines professional studies through its standards and programmatic expectations. Only a brief synopsis is possible here. Although NCATE has standards and

expectations for all aspects of the preparation program, e.g., general education, academic specialization, relationship to the world of practice, etc., I am using only the professional studies component.

NCATE's standards add up to the following definition of the nature and purpose of the professional studies component: "The professional studies component is expected to prepare education students to work effectively in their professional education roles. It should be a well-planned sequence of courses and experiences consisting of both cognitive knowledge about education and clinical knowledge derived from professional practice in schools. The course offerings and experiences should demonstrate the relation of appropriate knowledge to the realities of practice in schools and classrooms."

The several criteria used to explicate this broad standard reflects NCATE's conceptualization of the professional studies component, as follows:

1. Each course and experience of the professional studies component is built upon and reflects a defensible knowledge base.

2. The component must include knowledge about the social, historical, and philosophical foundations of education; theories of human development and learning; research- and experience-based principles of effective practice impact of technology and societal changes on schools; evaluations, inquiry, and research; educational policy. Courses and experiences support the development of independent thinking, effective communication, the making of relevant judgments, professional collaboration, effective participation in the educational system, and the discrimination of values in the educational arena.

3. The professional studies component must provide knowledge about and appropriate skills in learning theory; educational goals

and objectives; cultural influences on learning; curriculum planning and design; instructional techniques; planning and management of instruction; design and use of evaluation and measurement methods; classroom and behavior management; instructional strategies for exceptionalities; classrooms and schools as social systems; school law; instructional technology; collaborative and consultative skills. Courses and experiences ensure the development of classroom and time management, effective communication, knowledge of different learning styles, teaching strategies, and assessment techniques.

4. The curriculum must include clinical and field-based experiences throughout the professional preparation program to provide sufficient opportunities for the application and evaluation of the theories that are being taught.

A second model comes from my own state of Tennessee. We may be the only state that has statutorily defined teacher competencies and behaviors which research suggests are correlated positively with student learning. These competencies and behaviors have been translated into criteria for use in determining which teachers may be tenured, which can be given a professional certificate and those who will not be permitted to continue teaching. The criteria are used also to evaluate teachers in connection with the new Tennessee Career Ladder for Teachers. It is important to note that the expectations are stated in terms of behaviors and practices - not in terms of courses and credits. All SCDEs in Tennessee must, if they want to stay in business, see that their program in professional studies enables teachers to meet these criteria.

The Tennessee Career Ladder Evaluation System evaluates teaching skills and knowledge in six domains:

Planning for Instruction

Delivery of Instruction (Teaching Strategy(ies)

Evaluation of Student Progress

Classroom Management

Professional Leadership

Basic Communication Skills

These six domains incorporate a total of 18 specific competencies, which, in turn, include 87 "indicators and measurement statements."

Third, the program model I carry around in my pocket and believe in most strongly is the one we recently implemented at Memphis State. We developed and implemented it in two phases. We spent about two years synthesizing research findings and authoritative findings on teacher preparation and incorporated them in an undergraduate, three-tiered program. The first tier consists of generic, core courses and experiences we believed, according to our research, was the essence of pedagogical training, what all teachers needed to know and be able to do irrespective of their teaching area of level and whether it be in "regular schools" or in "non-school settings." The second tier is semi-generic, i.e., those courses and experiences which are needed for teaching in K-12 settings, as contrasted to those needed by teachers in non-school settings. The third tier is the specialization sub-component, knowledge and skills needed for specialized roles, e.g., senior high school math, K-12 music, etc. Once this got going with this new program we began the process of

transforming our pre-service teacher education to a five-year program - the "4 + 1" variety. The move required our compressing the professional studies component a bit, elevating the level and sophistication ofits content, transferring the specialization component to the work place (where it will be taught by master teachers within a full-year, full-time internship), and significantly expanding the general education component and the teaching field component by requiring the baccalaureate degree in the teaching field(s).

The professional studies program is built on top of a 10 semester hour pre-professional studies base which includes human development and learning theory, principles of teaching and learning, and in-school laboratory and clinical experiences. Our professional studies component is categorized as follows:

1. Generic studies in professional education including:
   a. The social, philosophical, theoretical foundations of education with emphasis on current trends, issues, and problems in education multicultural considerations, and the role of schools and teachers in American society.
   b. Principles of human development and learning theory applied to teaching.
   c. Handicapping and exceptional conditions of students and their implication for teaching and learning.
   d. Interaction and intervention strategies with students, parents, teachers, and other professionals.
   e. Instructional strategies and materials (including computer usage and the utilization of other media and technology), reading in the content field, classroom

organization and management, measurement and evaluation, and curriculum planning, strategies and resources applicable to the field(s) of teaching specialization.

2. A full-day, 36 week internship under a master teacher (Tennessee Career Level III), including specialized instructional strategies, curriculum development, material development and utilization, and direct teaching.

3. Research Design and Methodology

4. Thesis

Graduate-level study in the teaching field is also required, eight semester hours for students who come into the M.A.T. after having completed the pre-professional studies block, or five hours for students who enter without the pre-professional block.

The degree requires 45 semester hours and can be completed during a 15 month period. Clusters of 20 students are admitted only in June of each year. Graduates of the M.A.T. are eligible for certification in Tennessee as an apprentice teacher, being allowed to count their year's internship as the probationary year - now required for all beginning teachers in Tennessee.

As I said, this is the kind of program I feel best about. It is on the cutting edge and, I'm convinced, the type program necessary to prepare teachers for the world of tomorrow. I am further convinced that this kind of program will earn the respect and support of taxpayers and legislators. Our program has engendered more positive support from university officials, governing boards, regulatory commissions, and state political leaders than any educational creation I have been associated with in my 28 years in teacher education. I recommend it highly - and

our receipe is available without charge!

Now in conclusion, I want to list a few admonitions and precautions contained in the seemingly endless list of reports coming out on education.

Admonitions and Precautions

1. Pat Graham of Harvard writing recently in the Education Week , (1985) admonishes us not to rush into more gimetry and mechanistic changes which might cause us to overlook the real purposes of education. She says further that discussion about either curriculum or pedagogy is vacuous unless we have some agreement about why we educate.

2. Ernest Boyer (1984) exhorts us to go post baccalaureate in our training programs, utilize schools (internships) more extensively and more effectively in preparing teachers, and require an academic major and an academic degree as a pre-requisite for graduate-level pre-service teacher education. Obviously I agree with those recommendations since our new program is built along these same lines. (You won't believe it, but our design was on paper before Boyer's book on the High School was published. We've accused him of plagiarizing our model - just kidding, of course).

3. Gary Griffin (1984) now dean of education at the University of Illinois, Chicago Circle, stresses the crucial role of the induction period in the preparation of teachers and urges us to define and operationalize teacher education broadly enough to include an induction period as a part of the preparation program. Phil Schlechty (1984) reinforces this point by

advocating the use of career ladders and differentiated staffing patterns in schools in the preparation of teaching.

4. A Call For Change in Teacher Education (1985) recommends that each teacher education program "should be an exacting, intellectually challenging integration of liberal studies, subject specialization from which school curricula are drawn, and content and skills of professional education." Nine of the 17 members of the Commission beleved that the Commission's recommendations "were not far reaching enough, especially in regard to issues of the liberal education of teachers and the amount of time needed to properly prepare teachers." The nine members inserted a "minority" report which recommended (1) an in-depth study (major) of a least one academic subject, for both elementary and secondary teachers and, (2) that a minimum of four years be devoted to the liberal arts component and a minimum of five years to the total program. Again, you would expect me to strongly concur - and I do.

5. In our efforts to refashion and improve teacher education programs we should heed the good advice offered frequently by our colleagues in the K-12 sector. Bernadette Marczely (a high school principal in Ridgefield, Conn.), writing the in current issue of the Kappan (1985), offers this advice about teaching field preparation and also about the professional education component:

> 1. As a principal, I yearn for the day when prospective teachers will come to interviews with transcripts that reflect a proud appreciation of their chosen profession. Don't ask me to share in the hypocrisy of easy certification programs by pretending that 18 hours of freshman-level math courses can produce an informed, qualified high school math teacher or that physical education courses dealing with muscular development can give a teacher candidate the subject-matter knowledge needed for dual certification in

biology and physical education.

2. Next, I hope that education courses can be made truly relevant. It is a fallacy to believe that courses conducted in a college classroom can teach students how to teach in elementary and secondary classrooms or that a three- or six-month student-teaching experience is adequate exposure to the real world of teaching. The art of teaching can only be learned in a real classroom, in which one first spends a sustained period in observation, followed by a sustained period in direct experience.

3. Effective teacher education programs must seek more than just a passing acquaintance with successful practicing teachers. Successful practicing teachers should be important participants in every teacher education program - an adjunct faculty, if you will. This new role would set the stage for most relevant and vital part of teacher preparation. Like aspiring doctors in a residency program, aspiring teachers have the opportunity to learn in the very setting in which they are expected to practice - and to learn from the practicing experts in their chosen field.

Those institutions that have the guts to follow these admonitions and are willing to pay the price in terms of credit hour reduction, reduced faculty size, etc., will grow immeasurably in program quality and credibility! I hope that most if not all of us in teacher education will be able and willing to do so.

References

1. Robert B. Howsom, et al., Educating a Profession, Bicentennial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, AACTE, 1976.

2. National Support Systems Project, A Common Body of Practice for Teachers: The Challenge of PL 94-142 to Teacher Education, Washington, AACTE, 1980.

3. William G. Monahan, "Teacher Education in the '90s: A working paper. AEL Occasional Paper 016. Charleston, W. VA, Appalachia Educational Laboratory, 1984.

4. Dale Scannell, et al., Educating a Profession: Profile of a Beginning Teacher, Washington, AACTE, 1982.

5. Ernest L. Boyer, The Quest for Common Learning. Common Learning. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1981.

6. National Commission on Excellence In Teacher Education, A Call for Chanage in Teacher Education, published by AACTE, 1985.

7. B. O. Smith, A Design for a School of Pedagogy, Washington, D.C., U. S. Department of Education, 1980.

8. NCATE Redesign, National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, Washington, D. C., April, 1985.

9. Patricia A. Graham, Cautionary Admonitions From Our Educational Past, Education Week, January 30, 1985.

10. Gary A. Griffin, "Crossing the Bridge: The First Years of Teaching." Paper Commissioned by the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education and presented at the Hearing, October 4-5, 1985, University of Texas, Austin.

11. Phillip Schlechty, "Schools with Career Ladders on Differentiated Staffing. Paper commissioned by the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education and presented at the Hearing, October 4-5, University of Texas, Austin.